

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
OCT 06 2006

**REMARKS**

Claim 3 has been amended to correct a typographical error. No new matter has been added. Entry is requested.

The examiner requires restriction to one of the following groups of inventions: Group I (claims 1-6, drawn to a composition), Group II (claims 7-16, drawn to an article) and Group III (claims 17-20, drawn to a process for bonding).


Applicants hereby elect, with traverse, the invention of Group I for prosecution on the merits. Claims 1-6 are encompassed by the elected invention. Applicants submit that the restriction requirement is inappropriate in view of the prosecution history of the subject application.

Claims 1-20 have previously been examined on the merits. All 20 pending claims were examined and rejected over the prior art. In an office action mailed December 15, 2005, claims 1-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Boyce et al. (U.S. 4,284,542) or Venkatasanthanam et al. (U.S. 6,541,098) and claims 13-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Boyce et al. (U.S. 4,284,542) or Venkatasanthanam et al. (U.S. 6,541,098) and further in view of Mehaffy (U.S. 6,117,945). A response was timely filed June 13, 2006 in which the patentability of the subject matter set forth in claims 1-20 was argued.

As the claims have already been examined on the merits, applicants submit that no undue burden is presented and, as such, restriction is deemed to be improper. Reconsideration and continued examination of claims 1-20 on the merits is requested.

Early and favorable action is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Cynthia L. Foulke

Cynthia L. Foulke  
Reg. No. 32,364

October 6, 2006

National Starch and Chemical Company  
P. O. Box 6500  
Bridgewater, New Jersey 08807-0500  
Telephone No.: 908-685-7483